REMARKS

The present application was filed on December 18, 2001 with claims 1-23. In a response dated July 26, 2004, Applicants amended independent claims 1, 9, 16 and 23 to further clarify the subject matter of the invention, and canceled dependent claims 10 and 11.

In the outstanding final Office Action, the Examiner: (i) rejected claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 12, 13, 16, 17 and 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,256,620 to Jahawar et al. (hereinafter "Jahawar") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,604,141 to Ventura et al. (hereinafter "Ventura"); (ii) rejected claims 7, 8, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jahawar in view of Ventura in further view of Newton's Telecom Dictionary, 16th Edition (hereinafter "Newton"); and (iii) rejected claims 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jahawar in view of Ventura in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,349,290 to Horowitz et al. (hereinafter "Horowitz").

In this response, Applicants traverse the various §103(a) rejections based on the cited combinations since the cited combinations fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claims 1-9, 12-18 and 20-23. Nonetheless, Applicants have canceled claim 19 and amended the independent claims to indicate that the computed decision value is based on one or more attributes comprising at least one of: (i) an attribute representative of a business value associated with the user or the one or more applications; (ii) an attribute representative of a frustration level attributable to the user with respect to the one or more interactions; (iii) an attribute representative of an estimated profit opportunity associated with the user; and (iv) an attribute representative of availability of resources capable of taking the action; and to include the step of an individual monitoring one or more computed decision values, and the individual adjusting the decision policy, when necessary or desired, so as to improve business-related performance, wherein the individual is able.

Support for the amendments is found throughout the present specification and claims, by way of example only, see canceled claim 19; page 6, line 21, through page 7, line 14; and page 11, lines 18-26. No new matter has been added. Such amendments have not been presented earlier, since this is the first opportunity Applicants have has to address the newly cited Ventura reference.

The various combinations of Jahawar, Ventura, Newton and Horowitz at least fail to teach or suggest the step of an individual monitoring one or more computed decision values, and the individual adjusting the decision policy, when necessary or desired, so as to improve business-related performance, wherein the individual is able, as in the claimed invention. In addition, despite an assertion to the contrary in the Office Action at page 8 and 9, Horowitz (and thus any combinations

including Horowitz) does not teach or suggest that the computed decision value is based on one or more attributes comprising at least one of: (i) an attribute representative of a business value associated with the user or the one or more applications; (ii) an attribute representative of a frustration level attributable to the user with respect to the one or more interactions; (iii) an attribute representative of an estimated profit opportunity associated with the user; and (iv) an attribute representative of availability of resources capable of taking the action, as in the claimed invention.

It is also respectfully asserted that the claims which depend from independent claims 1, 9 and 16 contain patentable subject matter in their own right.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1-9, 12-18 and 20-23 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the various §103(a) rejections.

Date: March 3, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

William E. Lewis

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 39,274

Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP

90 Forest Avenue

Locust Valley, NY 11560

(516) 759-2946

8